DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 051 CG 015 785

AUTHOR Valasek, Diana L.
TITLE Retirement Satisfaction: Is There a Young/Old Old/Old Difference?
PUB DATE Nov 81
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Joint Annual Meeting of the Scientific Gerontological Society (34th) and the Scientific & Educational Canadian Association on Gerontology (10th), (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, November 8-12, 1981). For related document, see ED 212 917.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Development; *Age Differences; Attitude Change; Gerontology; Health; *Individual Needs; Influences; *Life Satisfaction; Morale; *Older Adults; *Psychological Patterns; Quality of Life; *Retirement

ABSTRACT

Research has begun to define the older adult population, not as a homogeneous sample, but as at least two groups with different concerns. To determine the factors contributing to retirement satisfaction, two groups of retirees, i.e., young-olds, aged 75 and under (N=49) and old-olds, over age 75 (N=49), completed the Individual Status Assessment Questionnaire (ISAQ) and the Retirement Descriptive Index (RDI). Subjects were compared using ISAQ subscales of health, morale, values, value orientation, leisure, social relationships, wealth, prior work satisfaction, mobility, and retirement reason, and RDI scales of activities, finances, health, and people. A discriminant analysis using all ISAQ scales and the RDI found age differences in leisure, health, morale, and overall satisfaction. The ISAQ subscales were used as predictors of retirement satisfaction based on the RDI. Significant regression equations predicting the four RDI satisfaction scales differed for the two age groups. Few differences were found between the two groups on the component dimensions of the ISAQ. Differences which emerged in the discriminant analysis and the regression analyses were in the weighting and patterns of dimensions which discriminated between the two groups or predicted satisfaction in the two groups. The findings suggest that the dimensions of satisfaction during retirement contribute differentially for the two groups. (Author/NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED214051

Retirement Satisfaction: Is There a Young/Old Old/Old Difference?

by

Diana L. Valasek
Department of Psychology
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325

Paper presented at the 34th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, November 8-12, 1981, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

CG 015785

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Diana L. Valasek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Retirement Satisfaction: Is There a Young/Old--Old/Old Difference?

Statement of the Problem

Retirement satisfaction is a multidimensional concept which has been approached from a systems perspective (Kimmel, Price, & Walker, 1978; Walker & Price, 1974). At this point in time, no model can explain why some individuals are happy with few material possessions and deteriorating health, while others have everything and are unhappy. One factor which may contribute to the ambiguity of research results is the age groups used in research. Subjects are often divided into age groups spanning 10-20 years, with the oldest group classified as 60 or over. This method assumes no differences between those in their 60's and those in their 90's; however, older adults may not be a homogeneous group of individuals.

Two groups of older adults have been defined in the literature: young/olds (those 55-75) and old/olds (those 76 and older) (Neugarten, 1974). The two groups were found to differ on marital status, living arrangements, work, income, education, health, and political behavior.

Atchley (1972) defines the stages of later life as "later maturity" and "old age." During later maturity, the individual has a growing awareness of aging and finds it more difficult to be future-oriented. A person in their 60's and/or 70's has a reduction of energy, reduced income, reduced social contacts, and long-term health problems which begin to arise. "Old age" is perceived as the beginning of the end. There may be extreme frailty, disability, or invalidism. Mental processes slow, activity is greatly restricted, and loneliness and boredom are felt to be problems.

Atchley (1972) and Neugarten (1974) are beginning to define the older adult population, not as a homogeneous sample, but as at least two groups with different concerns and different problems. Thus it is reasonable to expand the definition and refine the similarities and differences when examining older adult values and their retirement satisfaction. However, this can be a difficult task because of the dearth of valid, reliable testing materials.

A major concern is the validity of the age split at 75 (Krauss, 1980). It is quite possible that this is an artificial breaking point for the age continuum. It may be necessary to use narrower age categories or no age categorization. The differences found in the past between young-olds and old-olds are based upon SES variables and are not surprising in light of our changing society. The past research shows that SES relates to retirement satisfaction (Kimmel et al., 1978) but there is no indication that age has an influence upon satisfaction. There is no rational or empirical basis for expecting differences between the age groups on the other dimensions of interest in this study with the exception of morale. Overall morale appears to decline with age (Lawton, 1977a). For this research, the sample was dichotomized into two groups as suggested by Neugarten (1974) to examine whether there were differences between the young-olds and old-olds.

Method

Subjects

The sample consisted of 98 retirees ages 55 to 92, living in the community within a three-county area of Northern Ohio. There were 17 males and 81 females, of which 75 were white, 4 were black, and 19 checked other categories. The educational level ranged from 3 to 20 years with a mean of 10.8 years.

Procedure

Each subject was given the Individual Status Assessment Questionnaire (ISAQ) (Valasek, 1981)[1] which contains scales for: Value Orientation, Morale, Values, Retrospective Work Satisfaction, Leisure (frequent and occasional activities), Social Relationships (See, Talk, and Persons scores), Health, Wealth, Mobility, and Retirement Reason (mandatory or voluntary). They also answered the Retirement Descriptive Index (RDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), which has four scales: Activities, Finances, Health, and People you Associate With. The RDI has been used in the past as a measure of retirement satisfaction.

The questionnaire took approximately 2 hours to complete. It was given to one subject or to a group of subjects, whichever was available. All subjects filled out the entire questionnaire if they were used in the analysis, except for the financial information and the Work Satisfaction Scale. The Financial scale was optional, because some individuals feel that income information is too personal to reveal. The Work Satisfaction scale was

[1]The ISAQ can be obtained by writing Diana L. Valasek, Department of Psychology, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325.

only relevant for those who were employed outside the home prior to retirement.

The health scale had two measures: objective and subjective health. Subjective health was a self-rating ranging from poor (4) to excellent (1). The objective health was the number of days confined to bed in the past year and a score for reported illnesses. The scoring for days in bed was: none (0), 1-9 (1), 10 or more (2). The number of health problems was noted and a score was given based on the severity of the problem. Heart problems, cancer, stroke and paralysis were given 2 points, all others were given 1 point each. A maximum score of 6 was possible. The score for severity of the illnesses reported was used as the Objective Health score for the analyses because of missing data for the other items. A high score indicates poor health.

The Mobility scale was the sum of the responses for items which dealt with their means of transportation. A yes was scored 2 and a no zero. This scale dealt with how they got where they wished to go, how often they went out, and the means which they utilized.

Retirement reason was categorized as mandatory, voluntary, or could not determine. Mandatory reasons were: age, company policy, health, plant closed, or job eliminated. Voluntary reasons were: they wanted to, to be with spouse, spouse's health, no special reason, got married, spouse's death, or to care for an ill relative.

The Work Satisfaction questions were four retrospective questions referring to job satisfaction prior to retirement. Each question had a five-point response scale. An average score was computed for work satisfaction. Only individuals who were employed outside the home and retired at age 50 or greater were used for the analyses of this scale.

The Values scale contained 20 values which were an adaptation of the Christenson scale to older adult values. Each value had a five-point response scale of: not important (1), slightly important (2), average importance (3), fairly important (4), and very important (5). A mean Value score was computed for each subject.

The Morale scale contained 25 items each with a five-point response scale and several open-ended questions The response alternatives were: always, often, sometimes, seldom, and never. A high score indicates high morale. A mean Morale score was computed for each subject.

The Value Orientation scale contained 70 items initially. The subject responded yes, no, or ?. Yes indicated the item described their retirement situation, no meant the item did not describe their situation, and ? indicated they could not decide. After the reliability analysis, a 53-item scale resulted for which a mean score was calculated for each subject. A high score is considered desirable.

The Leisure Time Activities scale contained 17 items with a three-point response scale. Several open-ended questions were also used. The Leisure-O score is the

number of occasional activities. The Leisure-F score is the number of frequent activities.

The Social Relationships scale contained three variables. The total number of persons in all categories seen and/or talked to each month is the persons variable. The average frequency rating for all persons they talk to each month is the talk variable. The average frequency rating for all persons they see each month is the see variable. The final scale differs slightly from the scales of Conner, Powers, & Bultena (1979).

The Financial questionnaire was optional. An attempt was made to use the income category as a variable but this was not possible because there was too much missing data.

The RDI was given according to instructions by Smith et al. (1969) except for the elaboration of the title for the People scale. A mean score was computed for each subscale. The individual subscale scores for: Activities, Finances, Health, and People were used as separate indices of the subject's satisfaction with these four areas of the retirement situation tapped by the RDI.

Occupational information was coded for each subject who gave the information. The occupational categories used were taken from the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (1972) using the categories: professional, technical, and managerial; clerical and sales; service; agricultural, fishery, forestry, and related areas; processing; machine trades; benchwork; and miscellaneous. A 10th category was added for housewife.

Results

The differences between the two age groups were examined using the t-test program. Demographic items and all subscales were used in this analysis. Then group differences were examined using a discriminant analysis using the subscales to develop a discriminant function which would differentiate young-olds from old-olds. Finally, a regression equation was computed for each of the RDI subscales for the young-olds and applied to the old-olds. The correlation between the two scores (predicted and actual) was computed.

t-Test Results

The total sample was divided into a young-old group (Group 1) and an old-old group (Group 2). Analyses were then conducted to examine the differences between the two groups using the Fisher t-test. **Table 1** shows that few differences exist between the groups on the subscales or the demographic information. Significant differences were found for the overall RDI score, Leisure-F, and for individual items of the Mobility scale. The mobility scale differences were due to car ownership and needing to be driven by someone. The overall Mobility Scale does not reflect these differences.

Since the Value Questionnaire has traditionally been examined by looking at mean differences between groups for each value, individual t-tests for the 20 values were computed. The only value to show a significant difference was "freedom to go places" ($t = 2.30$, $p < .02$). Although many of the standard deviations are larger for the old-old

Table 1

t-Test Comparisons Between Young-Olds and Old-Olds

Variable	Group 1 N	Group 1 Mean	Group 1 Standard Deviation	Group 2 N	Group 2 Mean	Group 2 Standard Deviation	t-value
Values	49	4.55	.28	49	4.48	.48	.91
Morale	49	2.29	.56	49	2.17	.40	1.20
Work Satisfaction	40	3.79	1.14	39	3.93	.87	-.64
Mobility	49	14.57	22.15	49	9.81	19.62	1.13
Leisure-O	49	3.45	2.75	49	3.08	2.78	.66
Leisure-F	49	4.20	3.22	49	2.88	2.46	2.29*
Social Relationships:							
See	49	2.11	1.63	49	1.73	1.40	1.23
Talk	49	1.36	7.18	49	2.08	1.37	-.70
Persons	46	7.02	7.01	46	5.57	4.73	1.17
Value Orientation	49	1.89	.76	49	1.99	.78	-.61
Value Orientation External Scale	46	1.95	.68	46	2.00	.72	-.39
Value Orientation Internal Scale	46	2.00	.86	46	2.15	.82	-.86
Retirement Reason	21	1.52	.51	20	1.55	.51	-.16
RDI (Mean)	49	2.93	.15	49	2.83	.32	1.96*
T-Tests on Demographic Data Between Groups							
Health (Subjective)	49	2.10	.11	48	2.33	.88	-1.38
Days in Bed	47	.47	.78	46	.54	.78	-.47
Health (Objective)	46	1.11	1.27	47	1.23	1.13	-.50
Education	48	11.40	2.37	46	10.24	3.32	1.94
Mobility Items:							
Drive Car	49	.55	.50	48	.29	.46	2.55**
Own Car	48	.56	.50	47	.32	.47	2.44*
Miles per Month	32	268.34	313.02	30	177.27	283.77	1.20
Drive	49	.51	.51	47	.28	.45	2.38*
Take Bus	49	.49	.51	47	.51	.51	-.20
Take Cab	49	.08	.28	47	.17	.38	-1.31
Walk	49	.43	.50	47	.38	.49	.45
Someone Drives Me	49	.27	.45	47	.55	.50	-2.97***
Don't Go	49	.12	.33	47	.09	.28	.59
Trips per Week	39	5.77	4.08	40	4.33	4.26	1.54
Problems Going	47	.89	.48	43	.84	.37	1.63
Money for Gas	34	.68	.48	32	.78	.42	-.95
Money for Repairs	34	.65	.49	37	.89	.32	-2.34*
Retirement Age	33	61.33	8.49	34	64.12	8.77	-1.32
Contentment	47	4.57	.93	47	4.45	1.18	.58
Family	45	4.67	.93	49	4.76	.56	-.48
Care of Self	48	4.81	.82	48	4.83	.63	-.14
My Activities	49	4.51	1.02	48	4.19	1.32	1.35
Humanity	46	4.78	.59	45	4.71	.86	.47
Religion	49	4.35	1.09	49	4.47	1.16	-.54
Being Involved	49	4.29	.98	46	4.02	1.44	1.05
Health	49	4.90	.37	47	4.77	.84	1.00
Housing	49	4.69	.55	49	4.63	.78	.45
Privacy	49	4.61	.76	49	4.57	.76	.27
Friends	48	4.77	.56	48	4.79	.62	-.17
Freedom to go Places	49	4.88	.39	49	4.63	.98	2.30
Helping Others	49	4.69	.62	48	4.63	.91	.44
Getting Ahead	47	3.32	.62	49	3.15	1.57	.53
Honesty	48	4.96	.20	49	5.00	.00	-1.44
Practical/Efficient	48	4.73	.54	48	4.63	.79	.76
Equal Rights (Racial)	48	4.50	.88	48	4.56	.87	-.35
Equal Rights (Sexual)	48	3.94	1.40	48	4.06	1.23	-.46
Democracy	48	4.79	.50	46	4.80	.69	-.10
Patriotism	48	4.38	.44	47	4.79	.72	.72

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .00$

group, this did not effect the significance levels. This increase in standard deviations for 15 of the 20 values does support the idea that the older the group being considered, the greater the variability in scores.

No differences between groups were found for the criterion measure which was the RDI subscales (Table 2). Smith et al. (1969) report that satisfaction decreases with age yet this sample does not show any significant differences between the two groups. The mean scores and standard deviations are comparable to those reported by Smith et al. (1969) for a sample of retirees.
This data does support the idea of lower scores for older adults when compared to younger ones in the Smith, et al. (1969) sample, but not in comparison to other older adults as in this sample.

The pattern of means for this sample shows the old-olds are more satisfied with their finances and the people they associate with while young-olds are more satisfied with their activities and their health. The means are slightly higher overall for the people scale for the old-old group, but both groups' mean is lower than that reported by Smith et al. (1969). This difference is probably due to the problems of misunderstanding the category People as defined in the original questionnaire. For this research, the heading was elaborated because all interview subjects were confused by the original and felt that all their friends or associates fit one or more of the adjectives.

Table 2

t-Test Results for the RDI Scales

Scale	Group 1			Group 2			t-value
	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Activities	49	35.71	14.90	49	33.35	14.12	.81
Finances	49	28.20	12.42	49	30.33	9.80	-.94
Health	49	17.33	6.93	49	15.55	6.75	1.28
People	49	32.47	15.78	49	36.43	15.29	-1.26
RDI (Mean)	49	2.93	.15	49	2.83	.32	1.96*
RDI (Total Score)	49	113.71	35.79	49	115.65	32.12	-.28

*$p < .05$

Discriminant Analysis Between Groups

A discriminant analysis was conducted using all the subscales of the ISAQ. A significant discriminant function contained four variables: Leisure-F, Morale, Retirement Satisfaction (RDI total), and Health. The Wilk's Lambda shows that the test battery has disciminating power ($p < .02$). The group centroids are positive for Group 1 (.38946) and negative for Group 2 (-.38081). Table 3 shows the results.

This disciminant function parallels the findings of the t-test results to some extent. Although Morale and Health do not show significant group differences, they show the trend of lower scores for the older subjects. The Morale and Leisure-F variables are the first two variables in the discriminant function.

The case classification results in Table 3 show that the overall number of cases correctly classified was 63%; however, the discriminant function appears to classify more of the old-olds (69%) than the young-olds (57%) correctly. The probability of misclassification is 31% for the old-olds and 43% for the young-olds.

The ability of the ISAQ scales to predict the four RDI scales was examined for each of the groups. The best predictors for each scale from the regressions in ~~Table 18~~ were used to predict the RDI scales for the young-old group. (Table 2 contains the results.) For the Activities scale, Leisure-O, Leisure-F, and Objective Health explained 34% of the variance. Value Orientation was not a significant predictor. The Finances scale was predicted by Objective Health, Value Orientation, Values, and Persons.

Table 3

Discriminant Analysis Between Age Groups

Variable	Unstandardized B-weight	Wilk's Lambda	Sign.
Leisure-F	.27	.948	.03
Morale	1.43	.906	.01
RDI(total score)	1.62	.881	.01
Health	.29	.868	.02

Discriminant Function 1	
Eigenvalue	.152
Canonical Correlation	.363
Wilk's Lambda	.868
Chi-square	12.007
Sign.	.02

Group Centroids	
Group 1 (55-75)	.38946
Group 2 (76-92)	-.38081

Case Classification

Actual Group	N	Predicted Group Membership Group 1	Group 2
Group 1	49	28 (57%)	21 (43%)
Group 2	49	15 (31%)	34 (69%)

These explained 38% of the variance. Morale and Mobility were not significant predictors. Value Orientation, Talk, Objective Health, Persons, and Leisure-O explained 49% of the variance in the People scale. Objective Health, Leisure-O, Leisure-F, and Persons explained 33% of the Health scale variance. Morale and Mobility were not used.

The beta weights, shown in Table 4 and the constants were used to compute a predicted score for each of the four RDI scales. A correlation between the predicted and the actual scores was computed (Table 5). None of the correlations is significant. There appears to be no relationship between the predicted scores using the young-old group beta weightings and the old-old group's scores for the four RDI scales.

When the best predictors from Table 3 are used to predict the RDI scales for the old-old group (Table 6), the results differ from the young-old results. For Activities, Leisure-F explains 35% of the variance. For Finance, Mobility explains 12% of the variance. Talk explains 7% of the variance for the People scale while Objective Health explains 7% of the Health scale variance. Thus results indicate differences between the two groups which will need to be further examined.

Table 4

Regression Analysis Using the Best Predictors from the Overall Analysis for Group 1 (Young-Olds) (n = 46)

Variables	β	F	Adjusted R^2
Activities			
Leisure-F	1.89	11.54**	.34
Leisure-O	2.00	9.67**	
Objective Health	-4.02	8.40**	
	(25.29)		
Finances			
Objective Health	-6.02	21.63**	.38
Value Orientation	11.14	11.53**	
Values	-18.79	9.33**	
Persons	.43	3.71*	
	(95.17)		
People			
Value Orientation	11.64	11.54**	.49
Talk	.84	13.25**	
Objective Health	-4.66	12.48**	
Persons	.64	6.88**	
Leisure-O	1.13	3.10*	
	(5.71)		
Health			
Objective Health	-2.71	15.18**	.33
Leisure-O	.88	7.74**	
Leisure-F	.54	3.89**	
Persons	.24	3.56*	
	(12.80)		

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

Table 5

Pearson Correlations of Predicted* and Actual

RDI Scale Scores for Group 2

	Actual Score			
Predicted Score	Activities	Finances	People	Health
Activities	-.09	-	-	-
Finances	-.13	.02	-	-
People	-.11	.02	-.25	-
Health	-.11	.00	-.27	-.00

*Predicted score used the regression weights found for Group 1 to predict Group 2 scores.

Table 6

Regression Analysis Using the Best Predictors from the Overall Analysis for the Group 2 (Old-Olds) (n = 47)

Variables	β	F	Adjusted R^2
Activities			
Leisure F	3.29 (23.95)	26.05**	.35
Finances			
Mobility	.18 (28.47)	7.10*	.12
People			
Talk	3.34 (30.26)	4.86*	.07
Health			
Objective Health	-1.79 (17.80)	4.24*	.07

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

Summary

The t-tests (Table 1) show that very few differences occur between the two groups on the subscales or on demographic items. The education variable shows a slight difference which could be expected due to educational trends in the past 50 years. The other major difference appears for the individual Mobility items. The subjects appeared to circumvent transportation problems by having someone drive them, taking a cab, or riding the bus. The lack of a car does not appear to inhibit their mobility differentially for one group, since there is no difference in the average number of trips per week by each group. Very few in each group said they did not go. There were no differences between the two groups in their perceptions of the adequacy of the transportation or in their ability to get where they wished to go.

The scale differences (Table 1) are also sparse. The differences appear on Leisure-F and the mean RDI total score. There are no differences between the groups on the individual RDI subscales or any other scale of the ISAQ.

The Values Scale has been examined as individual items in the past finding a trend toward less importance attributed to personal values. This finding was not supported by the research using the revised Value Scale. The only value to show a significant difference was the "freedom to go places' value with old-olds attributing less importance to this. Overall, when using relevant personal values, as defined earlier, they are important to both groups with no significant differences in importance between the groups.

These findings were startling in light of previous research and current thinking. Possibly, the major predictors of retirement satisfaction tapped in the ISAQ scales reflect areas of concern to all. They appear to be universal concerns which can contribute to satisfaction and adjustment for both age groups. The feasibility of this assumption should be tested to begin "unlocking" the mystery of mental health as individuals age.

The next analysis examining the two groups was a discriminant analysis using all ISAQ scales and the RDI. The analysis showed some differences between those over 75 who may be feeling the effects of aging more severely and those 75 or under. These differences are in how active the person is, health, morale, and overall satisfaction issues. This analysis showed that the more physically impaired retiree does curb activities and may be gradually less satisfied with the total situation.

The implications of these findings are of vast importance to researchers and practitioners in the field of gerontology. Age emerges as a predictor of the obvious, poor health and lower morale. Since Health and Morale are interrelated, it is no wonder that if the two age groups differ on Health they also differ on Morale.

The results of the discriminant analysis imply that satisfaction in retirement may have different predictors for the young-old and old-old groups due to poorer average health of the old-old individuals. To examine this issue further, a regression analyses was done using the best predictors from the total sample to predict the young-old group's RDI scale scores. The results, shown in Table 25 show that the amount of variance explained by

the predictors for the young-old group increases substantially for the Finances, People, and Health scales when compared to the results for the total sample.

The predictors of satisfaction with activities were their leisure time activities and their Objective Health score. When predicting the Finances scale, Mobility and Morale are not included for the young-old group while Health, Value Orientation, Values, and the number of persons they see per month are. This indicates that for the young-old group, satisfaction with their financial situation is related to their health, their psychological orientation, having something to value, and interacting with other people. It appears to indicate that as long as their physical and mental health is good and they do not believe their social relationships are impaired, the young-old is satisfied with the financial situation. For the People scale, Morale and Mobility, are also not included as predictors. The major indicators of satisfaction with the people they associate with are psychological orientation, talking to people and interacting with a number of people, their health, and their occasional leisure activities. This indicates that a positive psychological orientation, being able to interact with others socially and being active are important to the young-old when evaluating the people they associate with on a regular basis. Satisfaction with health is predicted by the same variables as for the total sample -- the individual's health, leisure activities and the number of people they see or talk to each month. The variance explained by the variables is greater for this sample (33%) compared to 23% for the total

sample. These results indicated a possible difference between the two groups.

An attempt was made to cross-validate the regression results found for the young-olds. The regression weights shown in Table 4 were used to predict the old-old subjects' scores on the RDI scales. These predicted scores were then correlated with the actual scores (see Table 5). The results show that the predicted and actual scores are not correlated, which reiterates the earlier finding of differences between the two groups. If the young-old weights do not predict the old-old scores, the next question is what does?

To deal with the issue of predicting the old-old group's scores, the best predictors from the total sample regression were used as predictors for another regression analysis predicting the four RDI scale. Table 6 contains the results, which indicate different predictors as important for this old-old group and a major decrease in the variance accounted for on the Finances, People, and Health scales.

The evidence indicates that the two groups do differ when examining the components of satisfaction as measured by the RDI. The major differences occur for the Finances, People, and Health scales. One explanation for the differences when predicting satisfaction, considers the greater probability of poorer health with increasing age. As the health of the individual becomes poorer, there can be a strain on the financial situation. The combination of the two can restrict mobility, leisure activities, and social relationships which, in turn, can effect morale and

psychological orientation for the old-old. Satisfaction with activities is reflected by the number of frequent activities. Satisfaction with health is reflected by maintaining mobility. Satisfaction with the people they associate with regularly was reflected by those they talk to frequently, while the major influence on satisfaction with health is their Objective Health score. When the pattern of predictors was examined, the young-old pattern was similar to the old-old but the remaining predictors were not significant in the step-wise regression for the older group. Morale and Value Orientation would be included if the sample was a little larger. This issue should be explored to determine what factors are important to the old-old in today's society that will predict satisfaction with their life.

The emphasis throughout this research has been the incorporation of all feasible aspects of the retirement situation to begin to develop a knowledge base dealing with "successful retirement" so that individuals can be classified and those having difficulty can be helped. The Individual Status Assessment Questionnaire (ISAQ) was developed for these reasons.

This research found few differences between the two age groups (young-olds and old-olds) on the component dimensions of the ISAQ. The differences which emerge in the discriminant analysis and the regression analyses are in the weighting and patterns of dimensions which discriminate between the two groups or predict satisfaction in the two groups.

The emphasis in the future should be placed upon adaptation in all phases of the life cycle rather than emphasizing the individual's specific age. Psychological, social, and environmental variables all contribute to the individual's satisfaction with life and possibly influence adaptation. The issues of interest are: Do differences exist in adjustment or satisfaction due to differing levels of the component dimensions of the ISAQ? If there are, can minimum levels of each component be determined, below which maladjustment will result? The first question has been dealt with in a preliminary manner through the regression analysis. The second will need to be researched further in the future.

The age of the individual does not influence the scale scores on the ISAQ except for Morale and Health. This should be helpful in dealing with the second question (Can minimum levels of each component be determined, below which maladjustment will result?) This would be the thrust of the research in the future along with the validation of the ISAQ on various samples of older adults who are retired and those who are still in the work force.

This research has shown that satisfaction in retirement is a multifaceted concept which has led to confusion in previous research. The major benefit from this research is the development of a multidimensional questionniare which can be used in future research to examine the individual older adult's retirement situation.

References

Atchley, R.C. Social forces in later life. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1972.

Conner, K.A., Powers, E.A., & Bultena, G.L. Social interaction: An empirical assessment of late-life patterns. Journal of Gerontology, 1979, 34, 116-121.

Kimmel, D.C., Price, K.F., & Walker, J.W. Retirement choice and retirement satisfaction. Journal of Gerontology, 1978, 33, 575-585.

Krauss, I.K. Between and within group comparisons in aging research. In L.W. Poon (Ed.), Aging in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1980.

Lawton, M.P. Morale: What are we measuring? In C.N. Nydegger (Ed.), Measuring morale: A guide to effective assessment. Washington, D.C.: Gerontological Society, 1977.

Neugarten, B.L. Age groups in American society and the rise of the young-old. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1974, 187-198.

Valasek, D.L. Development of an Individual Status Assessment Questionnaire for Older Adults. University of Akron, Master's Thesis, 1981.

Valasek, D.L. Predicting retirement satisfaction using a multifaceted questionnaire. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Meeting, August 24-28, 1981.

Walker, J & Price, K. Retirement policy formulation: A systems perspective. Personnel Review, 1976, 5, 39-43.